

to



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/628,804	07/28/2000	Norbert Venet	Q60260	3500

7590 02/21/2002

Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC  
Suite 800  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

TUGBANG, ANTHONY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3729

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2002

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application N .

09/628,804

Applicant(s)

VENET ET AL.

Examiner

Dexter Tugbang

Art Unit

3729

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attachment.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 8-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
PETER VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Attachment to Advisory Action

In the proposed After Final amendment (filed 2/5/02) the following new issues have been raised.

Regarding Claim 1, the recitation of “the respective conductive tracks (line 15) lacks positive antecedent basis. Also, it is unclear whether this recitation is referring to “a respective set of turns of conductive tracks” (line 6) or “sets of turns of conductive tracks” (line 2). Furthermore, it is unclear if the recitations of “a respective set of turns of conductive tracks” (line 6) or “sets of turns of conductive tracks” (line 2) are referring to the same conductive tracks or completely different conductive tracks. How many conductive tracks are there? The above ambiguities raise new issues under 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

Regarding Claim 8 and the step of interconnecting (beginning at line 14), the interpretation of this step was that the previously claimed “conductive track elements” (line 14 of Claim 8 of the amendment filed on 7/25/01, Paper No. 7) were completely different and separate claimed elements from the “first conductive track” (line 3) and the “second conductive track” (line 6). Now applicants propose (in the After Final amendment, Paper No. 10) that the recitation of “track elements” be removed such that now, the step of interconnecting is exclusively referring to the previous recitations of the first and second conductive tracks. This proposal narrows the scope of the claims requiring further consideration by the examiner.

Accordingly, the above new issues do not place the application in condition for allowance.